

# Comment on “Thermal Effects on the Casimir Force in the 0.1-5 $\mu\text{m}$ Range” by M. Boström and Bo E. Sernelius (Physical Review Letters 84, pp. 4757-4760 (2000))

S.K. Lamoreaux

University of California, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Physics Division P-23, M.S. H803, Los Alamos, NM 87545  
(February 1, 2008)

In a recent paper [1] it is shown that simultaneous consideration of the thermal and finite conductivity corrections to the Casimir force between metal plates results in a significant deviation from previous theoretical results [2] and a recent experiment [3]. In [1], it is argued that the  $TE$  electromagnetic mode does not contribute as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  for a realistic material with dissipation (see Eq. (6) of [1]).

When the zero-frequency limit is taken in [1], it is asserted that

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} (\gamma_1 - \gamma_0) = 0 \quad (1)$$

where  $\gamma_{0,1} = q^2 + \epsilon_{0,1}(i\omega)\omega^2/c^2$ , 0 refers to the space between the plates (vacuum, so  $\epsilon_0(i\omega) = 1$ ) and 1 refers to the region within the plates. In [1], the assertion given in Eq. (1) above is based on the idea that, as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\omega^2\epsilon_1(i\omega) \rightarrow 0$  with the assumed form of the dielectric function, Eq. (6) of [1].

In taking the limit in this manner, some important physics is missed. The two evanescent wave numbers,  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_1$  describe the damping of the electric field in the space between the plates and within the plates, respectively. It is well-known that for static electric fields that the electric field is perpendicular to a conducting surface (even a poor conductor) and that the field penetration depth into the conductor is infinitesimally small (e.g., the field is cancelled due to charge accumulation on the surface). This implies that  $\gamma_1 \rightarrow \infty$  when  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , while  $\gamma_0$  remains finite.

In taking the zero-frequency limit, the proper result can be obtained in a transparent fashion if instead we consider  $\gamma_1/\gamma_0$  which should diverge at zero frequency. The point that was missed in [1] is that any non-zero  $q$  must be associated with a non-zero  $\omega$  because the plates are uncharged, and any differential accumulation of charge on the plate surfaces (e.g., due to thermal fluctuations) will be dynamic;  $q$  and  $\omega$  cannot be taken as independent integration variables, but are related in such a way that when  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  then  $q \rightarrow 0$ .

Using the substitution  $q = \omega\sqrt{p^2 - 1}/c$  where  $p \geq 1$  (as did Lifshitz [4]; this particular substitution simplifies later integrals), we find that

$$\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_0} = \frac{\sqrt{p^2 - 1 + \epsilon_1(i\omega)}}{p} \quad (2)$$

which indeed diverges as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , as expected based on

the simple physical arguments presented earlier, implying that in this limit

$$G^{TE} = 1 - e^{-2\gamma_0 d} \quad (3)$$

(which is Eq. (2) of [1]). Carrying through this substitution (see [5], pp. 227-228 and pp. 269-271), the previously obtained result is reproduced [2,4,5] for which there is no significant deviation between theory and experiment.

- 
- [1] M. Böstrom and Bo E. Sernelius, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4757 (2000).
  - [2] L.S. Brown and G.J. Maclay, Phys. Rev. **184**, 1272 (1969).
  - [3] S.K. Lamoreaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5475 (1998).
  - [4] E.M. Lifshitz, JETP **2**, 73 (1956).
  - [5] P.W. Milonni, *The Quantum Vacuum* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1994).